

ADP-98-67/T334
 UK/TP-98-16
 hep-ph/9810422

Hidden Symmetry and Georgi's "Vector Limit"

H.B. O'Connell^a and A.G. Williams^b

^a*Department of Physics and Astronomy,
 University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506-0055 USA
 hoc@pa.uky.edu*

^b*Department of Physics and Mathematical Physics
 and Special Research Centre for the Subatomic Structure of Matter,
 University of Adelaide 5005, Australia
 awilliam@physics.adelaide.edu.au*

Abstract

We study the generation of vector meson masses in the Hidden Local Symmetry (HLS) model of low energy QCD. After demoting the HLS to a hidden global symmetry (HGS), the ρ is explicitly shown to be massless for any value of the HS parameter a and the chiral partner of the pion appears as the Goldstone boson associated with the spontaneous breaking of the HGS, closely resembling the predictions of Georgi's vector limit.

Keywords: Chiral symmetries, Spontaneous symmetry breaking, Chiral Lagrangians, Vector-meson dominance.

PACS numbers: 11.30.Rd, 11.30.Qc, 12.39.Fe, 12.40.Vv

Recently there has been interest in the behaviour of ρ mass under certain conditions [1,2] and attention has turned to Georgi's "vector limit" in which the scalar and pseudoscalar fields are on equal footing and the ρ mass is presumed to vanish [3]. Our purpose here is to examine Georgi's assumption that the ρ mass vanishes in the vector limit and discuss the more general issue of the role of the ρ as a "dynamically generated" gauge boson [4].

We shall begin with a very brief outline of the Hidden Local Symmetry (HLS) model, introduced in Ref. [4] and reviewed in Ref. [5]. The HLS model has the vector mesons as the gauge bosons of a hidden local symmetry, as opposed to, say, a localised chiral symmetry (the so-called "massive Yang-Mills model" see Ref. [5]). The vector mesons acquire masses through the Higgs-Kibble (HK) mechanism [6]. In this manner, the HLS Lagrangian provides an accurate description of low energy QCD through its reproduction of the phenomenologically successful vector meson dominance (VMD) model (for a review see Ref. [7]). Let us consider the chiral Lagrangian [8],

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{chiral}} = \frac{1}{4} \text{Tr}[\partial_\mu F \partial^\mu F^\dagger], \quad (1)$$

where

$$F(x) \equiv f_P U(x) \equiv f_P e^{2iP(x)/f_P}, \quad P(x) \equiv P^a(x) T^a \quad (2)$$

is the chiral field and the $SU(N_f)$ generator matrices are normalised such that $\text{Tr}[T^a T^b] = \delta^{ab}/2$. This Lagrangian is invariant under

$$F \rightarrow g_L F g_R^\dagger, \quad g_{L,R} = e^{i\alpha_{L,R}^a T^a} \quad (3)$$

thus exhibiting the global symmetry $G = SU_L(N_f) \otimes SU_R(N_f)$, of massless QCD (for reviews see, e.g., Ref. [9]). The chiral field can be expanded in terms of P

$$F(x) = f_P e^{2iP(x)/f_P} = f_P + 2iP(x) - 2P^2(x)/f_P + \dots \quad (4)$$

Substituting into Eq.(1) we see that the vacuum corresponds to $P = 0$, $F = f_P$. That is, F has a non-zero vacuum expectation value, f_P , which spontaneously breaks the symmetry of the vacuum down to the subgroup $SU_V(N_f)$ in which $g_L = g_R$. Spontaneous symmetry breaking is a necessarily non-perturbative feature of QCD (for a discussion see, for example, Ref. [10]), and in vector-like gauge theories such as QCD, vector symmetries like the diagonal subgroup, remain unbroken [11]. The massless Goldstone bosons contained in P are the pseudoscalars associated with this spontaneous breaking of the coset space $G/SU_V(N_f)$ (also $SU(N_f)$) and correspond to perturbations about the QCD vacuum.

A local symmetry, H_{local} , can be added to this picture, with group elements $h(x) = e^{ig\alpha^a(x)T^a}$. This is done through the introduction of a scalar "compensator field" S transforming like

$$e^{iS(x)/f_S} \rightarrow e^{iS'(x)/f_S} = h(x) e^{iS(x)/f_S}, \quad S(x) = S^a(x) T^a \quad (5)$$

where we note the interesting feature that a gauge transformation $h(x) = e^{-iS(x)/f_S}$ can completely remove the $S(x)$ field. As it can be gauged away, $S(x)$ is unphysical. Thus the "hidden" local symmetry can be included in Eq. (1) by defining

$$U(x) \equiv \xi_L^\dagger(x) \xi_R(x), \quad \xi_{L,R}(x) = \exp[iS(x)/f_S] \exp[\mp iP(x)/f_P] \quad (6)$$

where

$$\xi_{L,R}(x) \rightarrow h(x) \xi_{L,R}(x) g_{L,R}^\dagger. \quad (7)$$

One now seeks to incorporate HLS into the low energy Lagrangian in a non-trivial way, thereby introducing the lightest vector meson states [4,5]. The procedure is to first rewrite $\mathcal{L}_{\text{chiral}}$ explicitly in terms of the ξ components

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{chiral}} = -\frac{f^2}{4} \text{Tr} \left[(\partial_\mu \xi_L \xi_L^\dagger - \partial_\mu \xi_R \xi_R^\dagger) \right]^2. \quad (8)$$

The Lagrangian can be gauged for both electromagnetism and the hidden local symmetry by changing to covariant derivatives

$$D_\mu \xi_{L,R} = \partial_\mu \xi_{L,R} - ig V_\mu \xi_{L,R} + ie \xi_{L,R} A_\mu Q \quad (9)$$

where Q is the charge matrix and $V = V^a T^a$ transforms as $V_\mu \rightarrow h(x) V_\mu h^\dagger(x) + ih(x) \partial_\mu h^\dagger(x)/g$. For full details of the matrices P and V and the effects of flavour symmetry breaking for $N_f = 3$ see, e.g., Refs. [12] and [13].

However, $\mathcal{L}_A \equiv \mathcal{L}_{\text{chiral}}$ is independent of V , and a second Lagrangian, $\mathcal{L}_V$, is introduced

$$\mathcal{L}_A = -\frac{f_P^2}{4} \text{Tr} \left[(D_\mu \xi_L \xi_L^\dagger - D_\mu \xi_R \xi_R^\dagger) \right]^2, \quad \mathcal{L}_V = -\frac{f_P^2}{4} \text{Tr} \left[(D_\mu \xi_L \xi_L^\dagger + D_\mu \xi_R \xi_R^\dagger) \right]^2 \quad (10)$$

Both terms are invariant under G and H_{local} . The full HLS Lagrangian is then given by [4] $\mathcal{L}_{\text{HLS}} = \mathcal{L}_A + a \mathcal{L}_V$ introducing the HLS parameter a .

It is usual now to eliminate the scalars (which might be considered desirable as no chiral partner for the pion has been observed) by choosing the unitary gauge where,

$$\xi_L^\dagger(x) = \xi_R(x) \equiv \xi(x) = \exp[iP(x)/f_P]. \quad (11)$$

However, the chiral transformation $g_{\text{ch}} \in G$ will regenerate the scalar field through

$$\xi(x) \rightarrow \xi'(x) = \xi(x) g_R^\dagger = g_L \xi(x) = \exp[iS'(P(x), g_{\text{ch}})/f_S] \exp[iP'(x)/f_P], \quad (12)$$

and the system would no longer be in the unitary gauge. The local symmetry, though, allows for Eq. (11) with the retention of chiral symmetry, G , under the combined transformation [5]

$$\xi(x) \rightarrow \xi'(x) = h(P(x), g_{\text{ch}}) \xi(x) g_{\text{ch}}^\dagger, \quad h(P(x), g_{\text{ch}}) = \exp[-iS'(P(x), g_{\text{ch}})/f_S] \quad (13)$$

where the local transformation, $h(P(x), g_{\text{ch}})$, “kills” the scalar field created by the global transformation $g_{\text{ch}} \in G$. The transverse vector fields acquire longitudinal components by “eating” the scalar S field through a transformation of the form (to lowest order in Goldstone fields)

$$V_\mu \rightarrow V_\mu - \frac{1}{gf_S} \partial_\mu S'. \quad (14)$$

With this condition $\mathcal{L}_V$ produces the Lagrangian mass term, $M_{\mathcal{L}}$, for the vector mesons,

$$M_{\mathcal{L}}^2 = af_P^2 g^2. \quad (15)$$

The interaction terms of the ρ , photon and pions are given by

$$\mathcal{L}^{\text{int}} = i[(a/2)g\rho_\mu + (1 - a/2)eA_\mu](\pi^- \partial^\mu \pi^+ - \pi^+ \partial^\mu \pi^-) - eaf_P^2 g^2 \rho_\mu A^\mu. \quad (16)$$

The choice $a = 2$ [4] gives the usual formulation of VMD, fixing $g = g_{\rho\pi\pi}$ and removing the direct photon-pion contact term (the photon can only couple to the pseudoscalars through the vector mesons). Eq. (15) then reproduces the KSRF relation [14].

Let us now discuss exactly how the vectors acquire mass, and the role of the scalar field in this in order to understand Georgi's massless vector limit and associated claim of a vanishing coupling constant through

$$m_\rho/f_P \rightarrow 0 \Rightarrow g \rightarrow 0 \quad (17)$$

as might be inferred from Eq. (15). We shall continue to work in the HLS model and restrict our specific attention to the neutral ρ . The relevant Lagrangian term is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{SV} = af_P^2 \text{Tr}[gV_\mu - \partial_\mu S/f_S]^2. \quad (18)$$

The gauge symmetry, H_{local} , is spontaneously broken by the vacuum expectation value of the compensator field $e^{iS(x)/f_S}$, and the field S is the “would be” Goldstone boson associated with this. The gauge fixing in Eq. (14) removes the S fields and reduces Eq. (18) to simply the Lagrangian mass term of the vector field. The vector limit cannot be realised, because the scalar field is unphysical, and so cannot appear as the chiral partner of the pion.

However, as Georgi points out [3], there is no physics in the hidden local symmetry. Indeed, while global symmetries are associated with observable currents, gauge symmetries merely represent a redundancy in the description of a physical system [15]. Let us now consider demoting the HLS H_{local} to a hidden *global* symmetry (HGS), H_{global} , but keep the vector fields which transform now as $V_\mu \rightarrow hV_\mu h^\dagger$ ($h \in H_{\text{global}}$). Naturally, $\mathcal{L}_A$ is unaffected by this: we still have G broken to $\text{SU}(3)_V$ by the vacuum expectation value of the $F(x)$ fields. Let us concentrate on $\mathcal{L}_V$. In this case the vacuum expectation value of the field $e^{iS(x)}$, transforming as $e^{iS(x)} \rightarrow he^{iS(x)}$, spontaneously breaks the H_{global} symmetry (the $e^{iP(x)}$ are singlets under H_{global} just as $e^{iS(x)}$ is a singlet under G) and the $S(x)$ are now legitimate Goldstone bosons.

We shall now consider the effect of this on the vector meson masses, in particular that of the neutral ρ , which is of interest as Georgi describes a vanishing ρ mass in his vector limit [3]. Introducing the chiral partner of the pion, σ (an isospin triplet), which is an element of S the way π is an element of P , Eq. (18) gives

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rho\sigma} = \frac{1}{2}af_P^2 g^2 \rho^2 + \frac{1}{2}\frac{af_P^2}{f_S^2}(\partial\sigma)^2 - g\frac{af_P^2}{f_S}\rho_\mu \partial^\mu \sigma. \quad (19)$$

The first term on the RHS of Eq. (19) is simply the Lagrangian mass term of the ρ generated by the vacuum expectation value of the field $e^{iS(x)}$. The second term is the kinetic term for the σ meson. The third term couples the massless σ to the ρ . We now see that Eq. (19)

suggests a slightly more general limit than Georgi's $a = 1$. So that the σ appears as a physical particle with a normalised kinetic energy term we have,

$$f_S^2 = a f_P^2. \quad (20)$$

We shall refer to this as the BKY limit (following Sect. 6 of Ref. [5]). However, f_S which has appeared here so far is merely a parameter. Let us relate it to the physical scalar decay constant of the σ , which defines Georgi's vector limit through [3]

$$\langle 0 | A^\mu | \pi \rangle = i f_\pi p^\mu, \quad \langle 0 | V^\mu | \sigma \rangle = i f_\sigma p^\mu, \quad f_\pi = f_\sigma, \quad (21)$$

The extraction of the pseudoscalar decay constants from the HLS Lagrangian is discussed in Section IV.A of Ref. [13]. Following this we find,

$$f_\sigma = \frac{a f_P^2}{f_S} = \frac{a f_P^2}{f_S^2} f_S, \quad f_\pi = f_P \quad (22)$$

and we find the BKY limit (Eq. (20)) yields $f_\sigma = f_S$. Setting $a = 1$, would then give Georgi's $f_\sigma = f_P$ [3], though this value for a seems disfavoured by data [16].

We are now in a position to determine the *physical* mass of the ρ . Firstly, let us state that we shall ignore the effects of pseudoscalar loops in the following analysis. These terms contribute to the vector pole through the polarisation function, $\Pi(s)$, which we define as being generated solely through meson loops. The physical pole, $s = p_V$ is then given by $p_V - m^2 - \Pi(p_V) = 0$. The polarisation functions develop an imaginary part above the pseudoscalar production threshold and move the pole of the vector meson propagator from the real axis to the complex plane, thus generating the physically important meson widths [17,18]. However, they have little effect on the real part of the mass term: numerical studies find the real part of the ρ mass to be typically altered only by a few percent, and even less for the ω [19]. Furthermore, as we are interested in examining Georgi's statement that the vector meson masses vanish, our interest lies in the vector propagators around $s = 0$. In a model such as the HLS model, the vectors couple to conserved currents, as can be seen from the interaction Lagrangian given, for example, in the Appendix of Ref. [13]. The vector currents take the form $J_\mu = a \partial_\mu b - b \partial_\mu a$, where a and b are pseudoscalars and thus $\partial_\mu J^\mu = 0$ from the pseudoscalar equations of motion $\partial^2 a = \partial^2 b = 0$. As $\Pi(s)$ is generated from couplings to conserved currents we have $\Pi(s = 0) = 0$ [20].

Therefore, the tree level is entirely adequate for our purposes. The physical mass is then determined by two things. The first, naturally, is $M_\mathcal{L}$, the second is the dressing of the ρ propagator by the σ (a similar effect is discussed for the weak bosons by Farhi and Susskind [21] and Peyranere [22] and for the $\pi - a_1$ system by Kaloshin [23]). We have

$$(D_{\mu\nu}^\rho)^{-1} = (M_\mathcal{L}^2 - s + M_{\sigma\rho}^2) g_{\mu\nu} + q_\mu q_\nu. \quad (23)$$

The contribution to the ρ dressing from the σ is given by

$$i M_{\rho\sigma}^2 = \left(-a g \frac{f_P^2}{f_S} q_\mu \right) \frac{i}{q^2} \left(a g \frac{f_P^2}{f_S} q^\mu \right) \Rightarrow M_{\rho\sigma}^2 = -a^2 g^2 \frac{f_P^4}{f_S^2}. \quad (24)$$

The mass contribution $M_{\rho\sigma}$ is seen to be *imaginary*, due to the relative minus sign between the σ momentum, q_μ , going *in* to each $\rho\sigma$ vertex in Eq. (24). This is much like what Sakurai

discovered for the vector meson contribution to the vacuum polarisation of the photon [24]. Sakurai realised that this could be cancelled by a Lagrangian mass term for the photon (see also Ref. [17]). Such a term is provided automatically in the HLS model, $M_{\mathcal{L}}$. The physical mass for the ρ ,

$$(m_{\rho}^{\text{phys}})^2 = M_{\mathcal{L}}^2 + M_{\rho\sigma}^2 = ag^2 f_P^2 - ag^2 f_P^2 \frac{af_P^2}{f_S^2}, \quad (25)$$

which indeed vanishes in the BKY limit (Eq.(20)) *for any value of a* . One sees the vanishing ρ mass does not require $g \rightarrow 0$ [3,25]. It comes automatically after one demotes HLS to HGS, which gives rise to a chiral partner for the pion [3,26]. Indeed, $g \rightarrow 0$ is merely the extreme case of our demotion of HLS to HGS, namely removal of the symmetry altogether ($h = I$). The vanishing of the ρ mass in the BKY limit arises from the cancellation between the σ meson contribution to the ρ vacuum polarisation Lagrangian mass term for the ρ . Therefore previous calculations where gauge freedom can be used to remove the $\rho - \sigma$ interaction [27] will miss this behaviour and describe a massive ρ [2,28]. Our choice of a hidden *global* symmetry, makes the $\rho - \sigma$ interaction unavoidable because the σ cannot be gauged away.

In conclusion, we note that the point of this work has been to examine Georgi’s “vector limit” within the context of the hidden local symmetry model of the low energy hadronic sector. By demoting the hidden local symmetry to a hidden *global* symmetry we have reproduced the key characteristics of the vector limit. We have shown that a chiral partner of the pion, which we refer to as the σ , appears as the Goldstone boson associated with the spontaneous breaking of the hidden global symmetry. Due to the contribution of the scalar σ to the vacuum polarisation of the ρ , the ρ is massless, as assumed by Georgi in the vector limit, but *without* the ρ coupling, g , also vanishing. In our hidden global symmetry model we find $f_S = \sqrt{a}f_P$ due to the normalisation of the scalar kinetic term, and Georgi’s vector limit constraint $a = 1$ serves only to set $f_S = f_P$.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank T.D. Cohen, K.F. Liu, J. McCarthy, J. Sloan and W. Wilcox for helpful correspondence and discussions. This work is supported by the US Department of Energy under grant DE-FG02-96ER40989 (HOC) and the Australian Research Council (AGW).

REFERENCES

- [1] G.E. Brown and M. Rho, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66 (1991) 2720 and Phys. Rept. 269 (1996) 333, hep-ph/9504250; P. Maris, C.D. Roberts and S. Schmidt, Phys. Rev. C 57 (1998) 2821, nucl-th/9801059; G.Q. Li and C. Gale, nucl-th/9807005; R.D. Pisarski, Phys. Rev. D 52 (1995) 3773, hep-ph/9503328; M.A. Halasz, J.V. Steele, G.Q. Li and G.E. Brown, Phys. Rev. C 58 (1998) 365, nucl-th/9712006.
- [2] M. Harada and A. Shibata, Phys. Rev. D 55 (1997) 6716, hep-ph/9612358.
- [3] H. Georgi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 63 (1989) 1917 and Nucl. Phys. B331 (1990) 311.
- [4] M. Bando *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 54 (1985) 1215.
- [5] M. Bando, T. Kugo and K. Yamawaki, Phys. Rept. 167 (1998) 217.
- [6] P.W. Higgs, Phys. Rev. Lett. 13 (1964) 508; T.W.B. Kibble, Phys. Rev. 155 (1967) 1554; see also Sect. 12-5 of C. Itzykson and Z.-B. Zuber, “Quantum Field Theory” (McGraw-Hill 1980) and references therein.
- [7] H.B. O’Connell, B.C. Pearce, A.W. Thomas and A.G. Williams, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 39 (1997) 201, hep-ph/9501251.
- [8] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. 166 (1968) 1568; S. Coleman, J. Wess and B. Zumino, Phys. Rev. 177 (1969) 2239; C. Callan, S. Coleman, J. Wess and B. Zumino, *ibid.* 2247.
- [9] A.W. Thomas, Adv. Nucl. Phys. 13 (1984) 1; Gerhard Ecker, hep-ph/9805500; A. Pich, hep-ph/9806303; C.P. Burgess, hep-th/9808176.
- [10] C.D. Roberts, nucl-th/9807026.
- [11] C. Vafa and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B234 (1984) 173.
- [12] M. Bando, T. Kugo and K. Yamawaki, Nucl. Phys. B259 (1985) 493.
- [13] M. Benayoun and H.B. O’Connell, Phys. Rev. D 58 (1998) 074006, hep-ph/9804391.
- [14] K. Kawarabayashi and M. Suzuki, Phys. Rev. Lett. 16 (1966) 255; Riazuddin and Fayyazuddin, Phys. Rev. 147 (1966) 1071.
- [15] N. Seiberg, Nucl. Phys. B435 (1995) 129, hep-th/9411149.
- [16] M. Benayoun *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C2 (1998) 269, hep-ph/9707509.
- [17] M. Benayoun, H.B. O’Connell and A.G. Williams, hep-ph/9807537.
- [18] S. Gardner and H.B. O’Connell, Phys. Rev. D 57 (1998) 2716, hep-ph/9707385 and hep-ph/9809224.
- [19] L.C.L. Hollenberg, C.D. Roberts and B.H.J. McKellar, Phys. Rev. C 46 (1992) 2057; K.L. Mitchell and P.C. Tandy, Phys. Rev. C 55 (1997) 1477, nucl-th/9607025
- [20] H.B. O’Connell, B.C. Pearce, A.W. Thomas and A.G. Williams, Phys. Lett. B336 (1994) 1, hep-ph/9405273.
- [21] E. Farhi and L. Susskind, Phys. Rept. 74 (1981) 277.
- [22] M. Capdequi Peyranere, hep-ph/9809324.
- [23] A.E. Kaloshin, Phys. Atom. Nucl. 60 (1997) 1179, hep-ph/9607344.
- [24] J.J. Sakurai, “Currents and Mesons,” University of Chicago Press (1969).
- [25] G.E. Brown and M. Rho, Phys. Lett. B338 (1994) 301, hep-ph/9408223.
- [26] C. Song and V. Koch, Phys. Lett. B404 (1997) 1, nucl-th/9703010.
- [27] M. Harada and K. Yamawaki, Phys. Lett. B297 (1992) 151.
- [28] R. Rapp, G. Chanfray and J. Wambach, Nucl. Phys. A617 (1997) 472, hep-ph/9702210 and Phys. Rev. Lett. 76 (1996) 368, hep-ph/9508353.